



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,960	11/24/2003	Richard D. Dettinger	ROC920030277US1	5201

7590 05/18/2006

William J. McGinnis, Jr.  
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917  
3605 Highway 52 North  
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
----------

DWIVEDI, MAHESH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/720,960	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DETTINGER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Mahesh H. Dwivedi	<b>Art Unit</b> 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                            | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/24/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 11/24/2003 and 10/27/2004 have been received, entered into the record, and considered. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: **"430"** in paragraph 56. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The applicant is reminded that all drawing should have an appropriate synopsis in the “**BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS**” section. In the instant application, Figure 4D does not have a synopsis. Appropriate correction is required.

The term “**430<sub>c</sub>**” in paragraph 56 should be “**430<sub>b</sub>**”. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-9, 20, 22-27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Win et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,453,353).

6. Regarding claims 1 and 20, **Win** teaches a method and computer readable medium comprising:

A) collecting runtime metadata relating to the application (Abstract, Column 5, lines 66-67-Column 6, lines 1-16, 44-46);

B) obtaining a list of all functional modules accessible from within the application (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65);

- C) identifying a limited subset of the functional modules that will successfully execute, based on the runtime metadata and metadata associated with the functional modules (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65); and
- D) providing an interface presenting the user with the limited subset of functional modules that will successfully execute (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65).

The examiner notes that “the runtime module on the protected server receives the login request and intercepts all other request by the client to use a resource” (Abstract) and “If the name and password are correct, the Authentication Client Module reads the user’s roles from the Registry server” (Column 6, lines 44-46) are analogous to **“collecting runtime metadata relating to the application”**. The examiner further notes that “a list of authorized resources” (Column 6, lines 13-14) is analogous to **“obtaining a list of all functional modules accessible from within the application”**. The examiner further notes that “a personalized menu is an HTML page containing a list of authorized Resources” (Column 6, lines 13-14) is analogous to **“identifying a limited subset of the functional modules that will successfully execute, based on the runtime metadata and metadata associated with the functional modules”**. The examiner further notes that “a personalized menu is an HTML page containing a list of authorized Resources” (Column 6, lines 13-14) is analogous to **“providing an interface presenting the user with the limited subset of functional modules that will successfully execute”**.

Regarding claim 2, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) obtaining metadata associated with the functional modules (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65); and

B) comparing the runtime metadata to the metadata associated with the functional modules (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65).

The examiner notes that “The Runtime Module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is authorized to access the resource” (Column 6, lines 61-63) is analogous to **“comparing the runtime metadata to the metadata associated with the functional modules”**.

Regarding claim 3, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein the metadata associated with at least one of the functional modules comprises at least one of one or more input parameters required for successful execution of the functional module; one or more output parameters required for successful execution of the functional module; and a credential of a user authorized to execute the functional module (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65).

The examiner notes that “The Authentication Client Module and Access Menu Module authenticates a user by verifying the name and password with the Registry Server 108” (Column 6, lines 42-44) is analogous to **“wherein the metadata associated with at least one of the functional modules comprises at least one of one or more input parameters required for successful execution of the functional module; one or more output parameters required for successful execution of the**

Art Unit: 2168

**functional module; and a credential of a user authorized to execute the functional module”.**

Regarding claims 4 and 23, **Win** further teaches a method and system comprising:

A) wherein at least one of the functional modules is a plug-in component of the application (Column 5, lines 13-21, Column 7, lines 34-42).

The examiner notes that it is common knowledge that an “applet” (Column 5, line 21) is visible and displayed via a plug-in.

Regarding claim 5 and 24, **Win** further teaches a method and system comprising:

A) wherein at least one of the functional modules is an external application (Column 5, lines 13-21, Column 7, lines 34-42).

The examiner notes that a “Web-enabled database” (Column 5, line 20) is an example of **“an external application”**.

Regarding claim 6, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein collecting runtime metadata comprises collecting session information during a logon procedure (Column 22, lines 15-29).

The examiner notes that “Session Security” (Column 22, line 15), “All transactions between components in the system are made using HTTP over SSL sessions” (Column 15, lines 16-17), and “session encryption key” (Column 22, line 19)

Art Unit: 2168

are analogous to **“wherein collecting runtime metadata comprises collecting session information during a logon procedure”**.

Regarding claim 7, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein collecting runtime metadata comprises collecting information regarding a current operating state of the application (Column 12, lines 32-40).

The examiner notes that “configuration information required for the system 2 to function” is analogous to **“wherein collecting runtime metadata comprises collecting information regarding a current operating state of the application”**.

Regarding claim 8, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein identifying a limited subset of the functional modules that will successfully execute comprises determining if a resource required to execute a functional module is available (Column 11, lines 42-48, Column 14, lines 34-43).

The examiner notes that “Access Menu Module 412 uses a Personalized Menu Service to build a list of resources that are available to the user” (Column 11, lines 46-48) is analogous to **“wherein identifying a limited subset of the functional modules that will successfully execute comprises determining if a resource required to execute a functional module is available”**.

Regarding claim 9, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein the resource is a server (Column 14, lines 34-52).



The examiner notes that "Web server" (Column 14, line 42) and "The Web server value identifies the server on which the resource exists" (Column 14, lines 51-52).

Regarding claim 22, **Win** teaches a system comprising:

- A) a plurality of functional modules, each having associated metadata (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65);
- B) an application from which the functional modules are accessible (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65);
- C) wherein the application is configured to collect metadata and present to a user a limited subset of the functional modules, based on the runtime metadata and the metadata associated with the functional modules (Abstract, Column 5, lines 66-67-Column 6, lines 1-16).

The examiner notes that "a list of authorized resources" (Column 6, lines 13-14) is analogous to **"a plurality of functional modules, each having associated metadata"**. The examiner further notes that "a personalized menu is an HTML page containing a list of authorized Resources" (Column 6, lines 13-14) is analogous to **"an application from which the functional modules are accessible"**. The examiner further notes that "the runtime module on the protected server receives the login request and intercepts all other request by the client to use a resource" (Abstract), "If the name and password are correct, the Authentication Client Module reads the user's roles from the Registry server" (Column 6, lines 44-46), and "a personalized menu is an HTML page containing a list of authorized Resources" (Column 6, lines 13-14) are analogous

Art Unit: 2168

to **“wherein the application is configured to collect metadata and present to a user a limited subset of the functional modules, based on the runtime metadata and the metadata associated with the functional modules”**.

Regarding claim 25, **Win** further teaches a system comprising:

A) wherein the runtime metadata comprises a user's session information (Column 22, lines 15-29).

The examiner notes that “Session Security” (Column 22, line 15), “All transactions between components in the system are made using HTTP over SSL sessions” (Column 15, lines 16-17), and “session encryption key” (Column 22, line 19) are analogous to **“wherein the runtime metadata comprises a user's session information”**.

Regarding claim 26, **Win** further teaches a system comprising:

A) wherein the runtime metadata comprises a system state information (Column 12, lines 32-40).

The examiner notes that “configuration information required for the system 2 to function” is analogous to **“wherein the runtime metadata comprises a system state information”**.

Regarding claim 27, **Win** teaches a data processing system comprising:

A) a data repository (Column 5, lines 13-15);

- B) a plurality of functional modules, each having associated metadata (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65);
- C) an application from which the functional modules are accessible (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65);
- D) wherein the application is configured to collect metadata and present to a user a limited subset of the functional modules, based on the runtime metadata and the metadata associated with the functional modules (Abstract, Column 5, lines 66-67-Column 6, lines 1-16).

The examiner notes that "The system 2 enables organizations to register information sources or Resources and register Users of the information in a central repository" (Column 5, lines 13-15) is analogous to **"a data repository"**. The examiner further notes that "a list of authorized resources" (Column 6, lines 13-14) is analogous to **"a plurality of functional modules, each having associated metadata"**. The examiner further notes that "a personalized menu is an HTML page containing a list of authorized Resources" (Column 6, lines 13-14) is analogous to **"an application from which the functional modules are accessible"**. The examiner further notes that "the runtime module on the protected server receives the login request and intercepts all other request by the client to use a resource" (Abstract), "If the name and password are correct, the Authentication Client Module reads the user's roles from the Registry server" (Column 6, lines 44-46), and "a personalized menu is an HTML page containing a list of authorized Resources" (Column 6, lines 13-14) are analogous to **"wherein the application is configured to collect metadata and present to a user a limited**

**subset of the functional modules, based on the runtime metadata and the metadata associated with the functional modules”.**

Regarding claim 29, **Win** further teaches a data processing system comprising:  
A) wherein the data repository comprises relational database tables used to store runtime metadata (Column 5, lines 13-15, Column 7, lines 1-6).

The examiner notes that “The Registry Repository is structured as a database. For example, the Registry Repository may be an SQL Server relational database management system, the Oracle 7® database, etc.” (Column 7, lines 1-6) is analogous to **“wherein the data repository comprises relational database tables used to store runtime metadata”**. The examiner further notes that it is common knowledge that relational databases store data in tables.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 10-19, 21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Win et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,453,353) as applied to claims 1-9, 20, 22-27, and 29 and in view of **Pazandak et al.** (U.S. Patent 7,027,975).

9. Regarding claim 10, **Win** teaches a method comprising:

A) obtaining a list of all functional modules accessible from within the application (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65);

B) identifying a limited subset of the functional modules that will successfully execute, based on the runtime metadata and metadata associated with functional modules (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65); and

C) providing an interface presenting the user with a the limited subset of functional modules that will successfully execute (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65).

**Win** does not explicitly teach:

D) collecting runtime metadata relating to the query session.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches “collecting runtime metadata relating to the query session collecting runtime metadata relating to the query session” as “LL interface descriptor (B), as defined in more detail below, which is sent to the Parser Farm 308 on the server below” (Column 12, lines 19-22) and “The Parser 310 can also send the set or a subset of the Interface Descriptor 306, e.g., LL Parser ID, transaction ID, or other metadata” (Column 17, lines 16-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Pazandak’s** would have allowed **Win’s** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 11, **Win** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein the runtime metadata comprises attributes of fields involved in a query or query results.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches “wherein the runtime metadata comprises attributes of fields involved in a query or query results” as “Sentence Construction” (Column 14, line 4, Figures 7-9, 11), and “Choice items” (Column 15, line 2, Figures 7-9, 11).

The examiner notes that the various screenshots depicted in Figures 7-9, and 11 all depict several attributes associated with various fields of query construction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Pazandak's** would have allowed **Win's** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 12, **Win** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein the runtime metadata comprises content contained in query results.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches “**wherein the runtime metadata comprises content contained in query results**” as “execution results of a sample LL query in a tabular format” (Column 32, lines 48-49, Figure 18)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Pazandak's** would have allowed **Win's** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 13, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) obtaining metadata associated with the functional modules (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65); and

B) comparing the runtime metadata to the metadata associated with the functional modules (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65).

The examiner notes that “The Runtime Module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is authorized to access the resource” (Column 6, lines 61-63) is analogous to **“comparing the runtime metadata to the metadata associated with the functional modules”**.

Regarding claim 14, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein obtaining metadata associated with the functional module comprises examining a signature validation (Column 6, lines 1-2, Column 14, lines 34-43).

The examiner notes that “users may log in either with a digital certificate” (Column 6, lines 1-2) is analogous to **“wherein obtaining metadata associated with the functional module comprises examining a signature validation”**.

Regarding claim 15, **Win** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein the metadata associated with at least one of the functional modules comprises at least one of: one or more input parameters required for successful execution of the functional module, one or more output parameters required for successful execution of the functional module, and a security credential required to execute the functional module (Abstract, Column 6, lines 10-16, lines 41-65).

The examiner notes that “The Authentication Client Module and Access Menu Module authenticates a user by verifying the name and password with the Registry Server 108” (Column 6, lines 42-44) is analogous to **“wherein the metadata associated with at least one of the functional modules comprises at least one of**



**one or more input parameters required for successful execution of the functional module; one or more output parameters required for successful execution of the functional module; and a credential of a user authorized to execute the functional module”.**

Regarding claim 16, **Win** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein at least one of the functional modules analyzes query results.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches “**wherein at least one of the functional modules analyzes query results**” as “a sophisticated extension is a capability for cooperative response, where if the user’s query results in a request for which no items are returned (it is overly constrained), then the translation tree can be examined to examine the results” (Column 32, lines 65-67-Column 33, line 1), and “A further sophisticated extension is to automatically relax some criteria” (Column 33, lines 9-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Pazandak’s** would have allowed **Win’s** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 17, **Win** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) the runtime metadata comprises the names of fields in a result set; and

B) the limited subset of functional modules comprises functional modules requiring data from fields in the result set as inputs.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches “**the runtime metadata comprises the names of fields in a result set**” as “Categorization-Group items into (possibly hierarchical) sets of categories, whereby the user selects a category and is then shown the list of subcategories or choice items” (Column 14, lines 64-67, Figures 7-9, 11), and “**the limited subset of functional modules comprises functional modules requiring data from fields in the result set as inputs**” as “Categorization-Group items into (possibly hierarchical) sets of categories, whereby the user selects a category and is then shown the list of subcategories or choice items” (Column 14, lines 64-67, Figures 7-9, 11).

The examiner notes that the subcategories depicted in Figure 8 are analogous to selecting various fields to further limit a query.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Pazandak’s** would have allowed **Win’s** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 18, **Win** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein the runtime metadata comprises information related to a query building session.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches “**wherein the runtime metadata comprises information related to a query building session**” as “Appearance during sentence construction” (Column 14, line 4, Figures 1-9, 11).

The examiner notes that the various interfaces depicted in Figures 7-9, and 11 show query construction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Pazandak’s** would have allowed **Win’s** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 19, **Win** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

- A) wherein the information related to the query building session comprises a specified focus of the query; and
- B) identifying a limited subset of the functional modules that will successfully execute comprises identifying functional modules associated with the specified focus.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches “**wherein the information related to the query building session comprises a specified focus of the query**” as “Categorization-Group items into (possibly hierarchical) sets of categories, whereby the user selects a category and is then shown the list of subcategories or choice items” (Column 14, lines 64-67, Figures 7-9, 11), and “**identifying a limited subset of the functional modules that will successfully execute comprises identifying functional modules**

**associated with the specified focus**” as “Categorization-Group items into (possibly hierarchical) sets of categories, whereby the user selects a category and is then shown the list of subcategories or choice items” (Column 14, lines 64-67, Figures 7-9, 11).

The examiner notes that it is common knowledge that in a hierarchical category organization, selected different categories yields different subcategories. The examiner further notes that a category is analogous to a **“focus”**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Pazandak’s** would have allowed **Win’s** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 21, **Win** does not explicitly teach a computer readable medium comprising:

A) wherein the application is a query building application.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches **“wherein the application is a query building application”** as “Appearance during sentence construction” (Column 14, line 4, Figures 1-9, 11).

The examiner notes that the various interfaces depicted in Figures 7-9, and 11 show query construction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching

**Pazandak's** would have allowed **Win's** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 28, **Win** does not explicitly teach a data processing system comprising:

A) wherein the data repository comprises XML data structures used to store runtime metadata.

**Pazandak**, however, teaches “**wherein the data repository comprises XML data structures used to store runtime metadata**” as “The LL Client code can take any of several forms: a cripted document using scripting language such as Javascript and/or dynamic HTML an otherwise encoded document using a format such as XML, or an application-specific encoding an HTML document” (Column 16, line 54-64) and “Properties can be encoded in various ways; for instance in XML” (Column 24, lines 62-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Pazandak's** would have allowed **Win's** to provide a method to implement more scalable and easier-to-use thin interfaces for query construction and execution, as noted by **Pazandak** (Column 1, lines 60-67).

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. PGPUB 2002/0083075 issued to **Brummel et al.** on 27 June 2002. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-29 (e.g., methods to use plug-ins in an interface for role-based users).

U.S. Patent 6,757,898 issued to **Ilsen et al.** on 29 June 2004. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-29 (e.g., methods to use plug-ins in an interface for role-based users).

U.S. PGPUB 2003/0140043 issued to **Hotchkiss et al.** on 24 July 2003. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-29 (e.g., methods to use plug-ins in an interface for role-based users).

U.S. PGPUB 20040249674 issued to **Eisenberg** on 09 December 2004. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-29 (e.g., methods to use plug-ins in an interface for role-based users).

U.S. PGPUB 2003/0229623 issued to **Chang et al.** on 11 December 2003. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-29 (e.g., methods to use plug-ins in an interface for role-based users).

U.S. PGPUB 2002/0091836 issued to **Moetelli** on 11 July 2002. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-29 (e.g., methods to use plug-ins in an interface for role-based users).

U.S. Patent 6,430,556 issued to **Goldberg et al.** on 06 August 2002. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-29 (e.g., methods to use plug-ins in an interface for role-based users).

***Contact Information***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mahesh Dwivedi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2731. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:20 am – 4:40 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached (571) 272-3642. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mahesh Dwivedi  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2168

Application/Control Number: 10/720,960  
Art Unit: 2168

Page 23

  
May 10, 2006

  
Leslie Wong

Primary Examiner